



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/991,388	11/15/2001	Cuc Hong	PDNO10019661	3280

7590 07/17/2003
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

LIU, MING HUN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2697

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/991,388

Applicant(s)

HONG, CUC

Examiner

Ming-Hun Liu

Art Unit

2697

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent 5,712,949 to Kato et al. and further in view of US patent 5,548,567 to Sawai.

Kato discloses a container configured to electronically display images and simulate a photo album storage device, comprising a display cover coupled to the storage housing (figure 2, item 15), the cover including a visual display device (figure 2, item 13a) and being configured for open and closed positions to cover the storage housing when in a closed, storage mode and to expose the visual display device at a viewing position when in an open, viewing mode. Kato also discloses a electronic processing device (column 4, lines 52-60), separate from the storage coupled to the storage housing and the visual display device, the processing device being configured to accept at least one of the plurality of removable memory storage devices and to process and display digital image data contained on the storage device. Kato's disclosed invention is similar to the device being claimed, however his electric photo viewer is not configured with a storage housing. Sawai discloses in figure 2, a storage housing having a bottom and a plurality of upwardly extending sides, the upwardly extending sides defining at least one storage cavity portion within the storage housing, the at least one storage cavity portion

Art Unit: 2697

being configured to concurrently store a plurality of removable digital memory storage devices. Sawai's storage housing is also combined with the media reader. It is true that neither disclosures discuss nor suggest the specific physical connection of the two components. Nevertheless, there is no disclosed criticality in the specifications as to why the claimed invention must be attached in this particular fashion. The combination between the operating mechanism and a storage container is not novel as shown in Sawai. Furthermore, it can be seen from Kato's figure 2, that the claimed attachment of the display screen to a storage device (admittedly storing only one medium) is not a novel idea. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combining a media player along with the storage device in the claimed fashion because of its conventionality and functionality of convenience with organizational and storage perks.

In reference to claim 2, it can be seen from figure 2 of Kato that the viewer comprises a navigation data entry interface (figure 2, items 10a, 10b and 11) and navigation control circuitry, each operatively coupled to the processing device to enable an operator to manipulate the digital images stored on the at least one removable memory storage device (column 5, lines 9-13) contained in the processing device.

In reference to claim 3, Kato also discusses on figure 5a, a data transmission and reception system (item 20) coupled to the electronic processing device, the transmission and reception system being configured to allow a user to electronically send and receive data to and from the electronic processing device.

In reference to claim 4, Kato does disclose an image data information display (figures 7a-7d), operatively coupled to the container, the information display being configured to

Art Unit: 2697

communicate to the user information relating to the digital images contained on the removable memory storage device contained in the processing device. Even if Kato's image data information display was is not the same as the one envisioned by the applicant, data information displays are very common in the art that the idea is not considered as novel but rather standard to the type of device being claimed. A content display has been customary to media readers so that users can have an idea of what is being read without having to scroll through the entire media, a feature that save times and energy.

Referring to claim 5, it can be seen from figure 2 of Sawai, that the container also comprises a plurality of storage compartments contained within the storage cavity portion, the storage compartments being configured to concurrently store a plurality of removable digital memory storage devices.

In reference to claim 6, neither Kato nor Sawai include telephone communication systems, coupled to the storage housing, that can be configured to be connectable to a telephone network to allow a user to telephonically communicate with others while viewing the digital image data displayed on the visual display screen. However, such a connection feature is rather common in today's systems. Video game systems, PDAs and computers, all of which display graphics commonly include telephone communication systems. It would have been obvious to include such a system in order to share pictures with friends far away or through an intranet/internet.

Referring to claim 7, it can be seen from figures 1 and 3 of Kato that the visual display device is configured for open and closed positions to cover the storage housing when in a closed storage mode and to adopt a substantially vertical position when in an open, viewing mode.

Art Unit: 2697

Claim 8 is rejected on the grounds outlined in the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6.

Referring to claim 9, Kato, when referring to picture 1 it can be seen that the navigation data entry interface further comprises at least one touch key button.

Referring to claim 10, it can be seen from figure 7a-7b of Kato displays the navigational data entry on the display screen, however he does not mention that display be a navigation data display with touchscreen capabilities. As one skilled in the art would attest, touchscreens are rather common in the art. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate a touchscreen display so that users can easily manipulate the contents of the display.

In reference to claim 11, it is obvious to one skilled in the art to include a remote navigation device in data communication with the navigation control circuitry, the remote navigation device being configured to enable a user to remotely navigate through the digital image data displayed on the visual display device. Remote control technology is very common to the art and they have been used for years in televisions, CD and DVD players. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate remote access to rifle through the media content for the convenience of users.

In reference to claim 12, there is no disclosed criticality as to why the container must have storage compartments where the storage sleeves are hingedly coupled within the storage compartment. Furthermore, such a binder arrangement has long been seen in the industry in case logic CD storage cases. It would have been obvious to incorporate such a binder contraption as the storage container because of its low cost and proven market appeal.

Claim 13 is rejected on the same ground as the rejection of claim 7.

Claim 14 is rejected on the grounds outlined in the rejection of claims 1 and 5.

Art Unit: 2697

Claim 15 is rejected on the same ground as the rejection of claim 2.

Claim 16 is rejected on the same ground as the rejection of claim 10.

Claim 17 is rejected on the same ground as the rejection of claim 11.

Claim 18 is rejected on the same ground as the rejection of claim 5.

Claim 19 is rejected on the same ground as the rejection of claim 3.

Claim 20 is rejected on the same ground as the rejection of claim 6.

Claim 21 is rejected on the same ground as the rejection of claim 4.

Claim 22 is rejected on the same ground as the rejection of claim 7.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

PCT WO 01/86407 to Fields: An electronic photo album

US patent 4,855,725 to Fernandez: An electronic book that is also very similar to the electronic photo album.

US patent D446,809 to Parker: Design patent for an electronic photo album.

US patent 5,991,594 to Froeber et al: Media storage with display device.

US patent Des. 419,534 to Kemp: Similar notebook/CD display.

PCT WO 99/56463 to Hornback: Replaceable media in electronic photo device.

Art Unit: 2697

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ming-Hun Liu whose telephone number is 703-305-8488. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Mancuso can be reached on 703-305-3885. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4750.

Ming-Hun Liu
July 11, 2003



JOSEPH MANCUSO
PRIMARY EXAMINER